REMARKS

First, Applicant thanks the Examiner for discussing the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, with the undersigned. *See Statement of Substance of Interview.*

Claims 1 and 2 are all the claims pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 2 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The previous prior art rejections are maintained. That is, claims 1 and 2 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Betts et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,669,090) in view of Scott (U.S. Patent No. 5,396,486) and further in view of Ito (U.S. Patent No. 4,459,589).

§ 112, second paragraph, Rejections - Claims 1 and 2

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 2 satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

§ 103(a) Rejections (Betts / Scott / Ito) - Claims 1 and 2

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant previously argued that none of the applied references, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests at least, "the first device outputting a sending request output for providing notification of a state of a communication request from the first device to the second device as a sending request signal using an open collector buffer and also turning back its sending request output inside the first device to check a communicable state inside the first device," and "if the second device is receivable with respect to the sending request signal sent from the first device, the second device outputting a sending permission output for providing notification of a communicable state from the second device to the first device as a sending permission signal using an open collector buffer and also turning back its sending permission output inside the second device to check a communicable state inside the second device," as recited in claim 1. *See pages 4-5 of Amendment dated November 9,*

2007. Applicants maintain that the features set forth above render claim 1 patentably

distinguishable over the applied references, except Applicants amend claims 1 and 2, as

indicated herein, for clarification purposes.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner essentially repeats his previously submitted

arguments, and does not substantially add any new arguments. Accordingly, Applicants

maintain that the cited portion of Betts only discusses sending a request-to-send (RTS) signal at a

particular time to a circuit, and that at a later time a circuit 26 sends a clear-to-send (CTS) signal

back to data terminal equipment 400 indicating that it is ready to accept data. To the contrary,

claim 1 describes that a single output (e.g., a sending request output from the first device) is

output for providing notification of a state of a communication request from a first device, for

example, to a second device as a sending request output and that the same sending request output

is turned back inside the first device to check a communicable state. Nowhere does Betts, or any

of the other applied references, disclose or suggest this particular feature of a single type of

output being output and that same output being turned back inside the outputting device. At least

because this feature is not satisfied by any of the applied references, we would maintain that

independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references, either alone or in

combination.

Applicants maintain that dependent claim 2 is patentable at least by virtue of its

dependency from independent claim 1.

Further, Applicants submit that none of the applied references discloses or suggests at

least, "wherein after outputting sending request outputs simultaneously from said first device and

said second device, respective times of said first device and said second device which elapse

before outputting another sending request output vary and are randomly determined by a

program of a microcomputer," as recited in amended claim 2. The cited portion of Betts only

discusses a data randomizer which is used to randomize the data so that an adaptive equalizer can

function. However, nowhere does Betts or any of the other applied references disclose or

suggest what occurs if sending request outputs are output simultaneously from two devices.

Therefore, Applicants maintain that claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over the applied

references, either alone or in combination

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 24, 2008